



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,113	02/03/2006	Valery Khazhmuratovich Zhilov	4874-7001	2931

85775 7590 09/08/2009  
Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP  
Attn: IP Docketing  
Three World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER
----------

LEWIS, PATRICK T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1623

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

09/08/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptopatentcommunication@lockelord.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/567,113	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ZHILOV ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Patrick T. Lewis	<b>Art Unit</b> 1623	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Patrick T. Lewis. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Matthew Eggerding. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 01 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 28.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yurugi et al. and Zhilov et al. (both of record).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Eggerding asked for guidance in regards to overcoming the rejection of record. The examiner explained that Yurugi taught similar compounds that functions as cardio-vasodialators (used to treat ED). The examier suggested comparing applicant's compounds with the compounds of the prior art in order to show unexpected results or providing prior art showing unpredictability within the genus in regards to this property.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Patrick T. Lewis/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1623	
---	--